

REMARKS

Claims 1-41 remain pending in the application, claims 1-18 and 34-41 having been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner.

Claims 20, 21, 25, 26, 30 and 31 informalities

In the Office Action, claims 20, 21, 25, 26, 30 and 31 were objected to because of noted informalities.

Claims 20, 21, 25, 26, 30 and 31 have been carefully reviewed, and are appropriately amended herein to be more definite. Claims 20, 21, 25, 26, 30 and 31 are now in full conformance with 35 USC 112. It is respectfully requested that the objection now be withdrawn.

Claims 19-33 over Oehrke

Claims 19-33 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 7,047,300 to Oehrke ("Oehrke"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Oehrke discloses a survivable data system that includes sources of mirrored data (See Abstract, Oehrke). Oehrke uses a router and server, but that is where the similarity to the present invention ends.

Claims 19-33 require authentication of an origin of a message.

The Examiner cites Oehrke's router 51 and server 76 (shown in Fig. 3), and specific disclosure at col. 7, lines 56-60; col. 8, lines 2-9 and 38-40; and col. 9, lines 19-41, for allegedly disclosing the invention of claims 19-33. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Oehrke teaches that the company A gateway router 51 authenticates the user ID and password, but that the authentication is of the user - not the origin of a message. The distinction is extremely important.

The 'user' as disclosed by Oehrke is COMPANY A. This is NOT the origin of a message that is being routed. Rather, company A is establishing mirrored data in a survivable data system.

Moreover, claims 19-33 not only require authentication of an origin of a message, but authentication of the origin of a message **before the message is routed** by a message router.

Not only does Oehrke fail to disclose authentication of the **origin** of a message, Oehrke further fails to disclose such authentication of the **origin** of a message **before the message is routed**.

Oehrke explains that the data center provides various applications and associated data for customers or owners, e.g., company A, who may use the data center for its intranet network. (Oehrke, col. 7, lines 42-45). Once company A has been authenticated, then the “users of intranet network 54 are provided with access to the data center 52.” (Oehrke, col. 7, lines 48-50).

Oehrke authenticates that the NETWORK has access to use resources on a mirrored network—not the origin of a message that is being routed, much less the origin of a message BEFORE it is routed, as claimed by claims 19-33.

For at least all the above reasons, claims 19-33 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "W H Boll", written over a horizontal line.

William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor
Washington D.C. 20036-3307